MARATHON – 2,500 YEARS

BULLETIN OF THE INSTITUTE OF CLASSICAL STUDIES SUPPLEMENT 124

DIRECTOR & GENERAL EDITOR: JOHN NORTH

DIRECTOR OF PUBLICATIONS: RICHARD SIMPSON

MARATHON – 2,500 YEARS
PROCEEDINGS OF THE MARATHON CONFERENCE 2010

EDITED BY CHRISTOPHER CAREY & MICHAEL EDWARDS

INSTITUTE OF CLASSICAL STUDIES
SCHOOL OF ADVANCED STUDY
UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

2013

The cover image shows Persian warriors at Ishtar Gate, from before the fourth century BC. Pergamon Museum/Vorderasiatisches Museum, Berlin.
Photo Mohammed Shamma (2003). Used under CC-BY terms. All rights reserved.

ISBN 978-1-905670-52-9

Designed and computer typeset at the Institute of Classical Studies.

Printed by Short Run Press Limited, Bittern Road, Exeter EX2 7LW.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introductory note		1
P. J. Rhodes	The battle of Marathon and modern scholarship	3
Christopher Pelling	Herodotus' Marathon	23
Peter Krentz	Marathon and the development of the exclusive hoplite phalanx	35
Andrej Petrovic	The battle of Marathon in pre-Herodotean sources: on Marathon verse-inscriptions (*IG* I^3 503/504; *Seg* Lvi 430)	45
V. L. Konstantinopoulos	The Persian wars and political conflicts in Athens	63
Andreas Markantonatos	The silence of Thucydides: the battle of Marathon and Athenian pride	69
K. W. Arafat	Marathon in art	79
Ariadne Gartziou-Tatti	Gods, heroes and the battle of Marathon	91
Antonis Mastrapas	The battle of Marathon and the introduction of Pan's worship to Athens: the political dimension of a legend through written evidence and archaeological finds	111
Christopher Carey	Marathon and the construction of the comic past	123
Efi Papadodima	The Battle of Marathon in fifth-century drama	143
Ioanna Karamanou	As threatening as the Persians: Euripides in Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae*	155
Eleni Volonaki	The Battle of Marathon in funeral speeches	165
Athanasios Efstathiou	The historical example of Marathon as used in the speeches *On the false embassy*, *On the crown*, and *Against Ctesiphon* by Demosthenes and Aeschines	181

Christos Kremmydas	Alexander the Great, Athens, and the rhetoric of the Persian wars	199
Georgia Xanthaki-Karamanou	The Battle of Marathon as a *topos* of Athenian political prestige in Classical times	213
Christopher Tuplin	Intolerable clothes and a terrifying name: the characteristics of an Achaemenid invasion force	223
Ewen Bowie	Marathon in the Greek culture of the Second century AD	241
Michael Jung	Marathon and the construction of the Persian wars in Antiquity and modern times. Part I: Antiquity	255
Peter Funke	Marathon and the construction of the Persian wars in post-Antique times	267
Lorna Hardwick	Moving targets, modern contests: Marathon and cultural memory	275
Index		289

THE BATTLE OF MARATHON IN PRE-HERODOTEAN SOURCES: ON MARATHON VERSE-INSCRIPTIONS (*IG* I^3 503/504; *SEG* LVI 430)[1]

ANDREJ PETROVIC

Verse-inscriptions count among the most prominent and immediate historiographical media the young Athenian democracy (or, more precisely, *isokratia* or *isēgoria*)[2] adopted to commemorate significant events, both intra-political and inter-political: from around 510 BC onwards the city of Athens started transforming her public civic and sacred spaces alike into exhibition spaces showcasing inscribed memoranda of constitutional creed and mementos of challenges conquered.[3] A literate mid-fifth-century BC visitor to the city could have learned relatively effortlessly a fair amount about her recent history during a stroll along the Panathenaic way, starting from the Dipylon gate, over the Kerameikos, cutting diagonally across the Agora, and ending the walk on the Acropolis. On the way, this enthusiast for the city's history could have learned from verse-inscriptions alone about the constitutional change of 510-508 BC from Kritias and Antenor's monument to the tyrant slayers, about the external threats Athens had to face shortly thereafter in battles against the Boeotians and Chalkidians from the quadriga set up at the entrance to Acropolis, and about prominent generals and their courage during the Persian Wars. Around the Metroon he could have seen recently fashioned herms as well,

[1] I am very grateful to the organizers of the Marathon conference and to Chris Carey for their invitation and generous hospitality, as well as to the audience for many helpful suggestions and comments. Ewen Bowie very kindly allowed me to see two drafts of his paper 'Marathon in fifth-century epigram' and generously shared with me his inspiring views on both texts I focus on in this paper. I am very grateful to Peter J. Rhodes with whom I had the privilege of discussing a number of issues concerning these texts. I am also very grateful to Annette Harder who very generously shared with me her observations concerning the forthcoming publication of an inscription containing a Thessalian heroic catalogue in hexameters (on this see below), and for allowing me to see the photos and a transcription of this fascinating new text. I thank Nikolaos Papazarkadas for informing me of Spyropoulos' 2009 report of the text, and Angelos Chaniotis for alerting me to Steinhauer's 2009 publication. I owe a great debt of gratitude to Cathy Keesling as well, who has pointed out to me the parallel for the inscriptional style of the casualty list in *SEG* LVI 430 in her 2003 publication and is finishing a paper on this topic. The abbreviations of the epigraphic corpora follow *SEG*.

[2] K. Raaflaub, 'Equalities and inequalities in Athenian democracy', in *Demokratia. A conversation on democracies, ancient and modern*, ed. J. Ober and C. Hedrick (New Jersey 1997) 139-74 (144).

[3] See W. Gauer, *Weihgeschenke aus den Perserkriegen* (Tübingen 1968); T. Hölscher, *Öffentliche Räume in frühen griechischen Städten* (Heidelberg 1998).

commemorating the battle of Eion and praising Athens' generals in epic language laden with Homeric reminiscences.[4]

Verse-inscriptions were used also to memorialize international conflicts. All of the major battles of the Persian Wars were the subject of such commemoration,[5] and interestingly enough the practice was not limited to Athens – a number of Greek city-states developed commemorative practices that included setting up monuments accompanied by verse-inscriptions in their city centres and/or on battlefields. To list but a few: the Spartans and Peloponnesians famously commemorated their dead at Thermopylae with epigrams, as did the Corinthians their fallen at Salamis, as did even the citizens of the small city of Opous for their soldiers fallen alongside Spartans.[6] Yet, the origins of epigrammatic historiography in the sense of commemoration of the war-dead – adopted from early on by cities big and small, Doric and Ionic alike – predate the Persian Wars by more than half a century. Recent finds in particular make it clear that epigrams were used in the commemorative setting of *polyandria* as early as the mid-sixth century BC: in the late eighties, Andreou published an intriguing text from Ambrakia, consisting of an epigram of at least 10 verses (five elegiac disticha) and listing *nominatim* at least four Ambrakiots who have fallen in a battle, thus providing a sort of versified catalogue of heroism.[7]

For ancient historians, therefore, verse-inscriptions represent a very valuable source for study of *poleis*' early fifth-century self-definition and self-representation: in these texts we recognize seldom available historiographic material which provides us with communities' immediate reactions to their past and what purports to encapsulate a shared and communal view of the events experienced. In a way, early epigrammatic historiography can be viewed as one of the most powerful media and disseminators of public ideology, transporters of what Hans Joachim Gehrke has appropriately labelled '*intentionale Geschichte*' ('intentional history').[8] In this sense, I shall offer some

[4] Tyrant killers: *CEG* 430 with *CEG* II, p. 304; Athenian battle against the Boeotians and Chalkidians: *CEG* 179; Eion: Aeschines 3.183-85. Whereas some of *CEG* 430 and *CEG* 179 were destroyed during the Persian destruction of Athens, it is a majority view that both were replaced with new inscriptions by the mid-fifth century BC (if not earlier).

[5] On epigrams on the Persian Wars, see F. Jacoby, 'Some Athenian epigrams from the Persian Wars' *Hesperia* 14 (1945) 157-211; C. Higbie, 'Epigrams on the Persian Wars: monuments, memory, and politics', in *Archaic and classical Greek epigram*, ed. M. Baumbach, A. Petrovic, and I. Petrovic (Cambridge 2010) 183-201.

[6] Spartans and Peloponnesians at Thermopylae: Hdt. 7.228; Corinthians at Salamis: *IG* I^3 1143 with Plut. *Mg. Hdt.* 39.870E; citizens of Opous at Thermopylae: Strabo 9.4.2.

[7] See *SEG* XLI 540.

[8] On epigram and history, see J. W. Day, 'Epigrams and history: the Athenian tyrannicides, a case in point', in *The Greek historians. Literature and history*, ed. M. H. Jameson (Stanford 1985) 25-46; M. Ebbot, 'The list of the war dead in Aeschylus' "Persians"', *HSCPh* 100 (2000) 83-96; A. J. Podlecki, 'The political significance of the Athenian 'tyrannicide'-cult', *Historia* 15 (1966) 129-41; L. Prandi, 'I caduti delle guerre persiane. (Morti per la città o morti per la Grecia?)', in *'Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori'. La morte in combattimento nell'antichità*, ed. M. Sordi (Milano 1990) 47-68; A. Petrovic, 'True lies of Athenian public epigrams: rituals, half truths and propaganda in the aftermath of the Persian Wars', in *Archaic and classical Greek epigram*, ed. Baumbach, Petrovic, and Petrovic (n. 5 above) 202-15. Gehrke developed in detail his concept of

observations on recently found verse-inscriptions commemorating the battle of Marathon and investigate these texts as media of commemoration. The aim of this paper is, then, to take a look at the way in which some of the earliest surviving historiographical accounts construct the memory of the battle and to place these accounts, as far as is possible, within the dominant political discourse in which they emerged, by which they were shaped, or to which they possibly reacted directly.

By the time of the battle of Marathon, commemorative epigrams will have been perceived as a relatively well-established and conventional historiographic medium – as was most certainly the case for Herodotus, who quoted no less than eight verse-inscriptions in his *Histories*, although in a sense oddly he does not mention the inscriptions from the *Soros*.[9] When one takes a look at the extant epigrams commemorating the battle of Marathon, their number certainly confirms this notion of their well-established status as a historiographical medium – more than half a dozen epigrams from the fifth century alone have been associated with the battle, more or less persuasively.[10] Of these, two merit particular attention, both because they were not composed for individuals but for groups of fallen warriors, and because they survive on stones which were, as far as we can tell, first inscribed in the 480s and 470s, and *ipso facto* belong to the earliest available appraisal of the glorious *aristeiai* of the Athenian warriors. In what follows, I shall first very briefly reassess *IG* I^3 503/504 (in my opinion still misleadingly labelled 'Marathon' epigrams from the Athenian *agora*), and then move on to discuss a very intriguing new inscription, a commemorative epigram for the fallen of the tribe Erechtheis, found in the villa of Herodes Atticus in Eva/Loukou in the Peloponnese and recently fully published and discussed by Georgios Steinhauer.[11] In this context, I shall very tentatively suggest a possible political context in which this text was produced, and try to define its significance within the contemporary political and religious discourses of its day.

Marathon verse-inscriptions

a) *IG* I^3 503/504

Of all the verse-inscriptions traditionally connected with the battle of Marathon, the fragments of *IG* I^3 503/504 have provoked the most scholarly debate, to the extent that

'Intentionale Geschichte' in his seminal 2003 article which pays special attention to Marathon as an Athenian foundational myth. See H. J. Gehrke, 'Was heißt und zu welchem Ende studiert man intentionale Geschichte? Marathon und Troja als fundierende Mythen', in *Gründungsmythen, Genealogien, Memorialzeichen. Beiträge zur institutionellen Konstruktion von Kontinuität*, ed. G. Melville and K.-S. Rehberg (Köln 2003) 21-36.

[9] See A. Petrovic, 'Inscribed epigram in pre-Hellenistic literary sources', in *The Brill companion to Hellenistic epigram*, ed. P. Bing and S. J. Bruss (Leiden 2007) 49-68.

[10] See E. Bowie, 'Marathon in fifth-century epigram', in *Μαραθών: η μάχη και ο αρχαίος Δήμος / Marathon: the battle and the ancient deme*, ed. K. Buraselis and K. Meidani (Athens 2010) 203-19; L. Kowerski, *Simonides on the Persian Wars: a study of the elegiac verses of the new Simonides* (New York 2005) appendix I, for a list of epigrams dealing with the Persian Wars.

[11] See *SEG* LI 425 and now G. Steinhauer, 'Στήλη πεσόντων τῆς Ἐρεχθηίδος', *Horos* 17-21 (2004-09) 679-92.

this text became a subject of an entire PhD and prompted Felix Jacoby in the 1940s to state in half-desperation: 'I almost regret that I have decided on discussing them'.[12]

Seventy-odd years later, some things have changed. The most notable recent development was that Angelos Matthaiou has conclusively (in my view) shown that what was thought to be a fragment of the fourth-century BC copy of the memorial almost certainly does not belong to the monument at all.[13] The number of suggestions concerning the battle (or the battles), however, to which these verse-inscriptions might pertain, remains vast.[14] I reproduce my edition of the text:[15]

A) ἀνδρῶν τῶνδ' ἀρετῆ[ς _____8__ λάμπει κλέο]ς αἰεί
[_____9_____]ν[.]ρ.[__17_____]
ἔσχον γὰρ πεζοί τε [_____14-16_____]ν
Ἑλλά[δα μ]ὴ πᾶσαν δούλιο[ν ἦμαρ ἰδεῖν].

β) ἦν ἄρα τοῖσζ' ἀδάμ[αντος ὑπέρβιον ἦτορ,]. ὅτ' αἰχμὴν
στῆσαν πρόσθε πυλῶν ἀγ[____16-18?_____]
ἀγχιάλων πρῆσαι ρ[_____18_____]ο
ἄστυ βίᾳ Περσῶν κλιναμένω[ν ___10-12_____]

γ) [_____πε]ζοί τε καὶ |≡[– ∪]
[_____]
[_____]ο νήσῳ
[_____]βαλών.

δ) ἕρκους γὰρ προπάρ̣ο̣ιθεν [_____]
..Ε [___]μεν Παλλάδος ἱπ̣ο̣[___]
οὖθαρ δ' ἀπείρου πορτιτρόφου ἄκρον ἔχοντες
τοῖσιν πανθαλῆς ὄλβος ἐπιστρέ[φεται].

[12] The bibliography on these fragments is overwhelming; for an overview, see A. Petrovic, *Kommentar zu den simondeisichen Versinschriften* (Leiden 2007) 158-60; J. J. Finni, *Concerning the text and sense of Athenian distichs associated with the Persian Wars* (Diss. Brown 1989); Jacoby, 'Some Athenian epigrams' (n. 5 above) 161.

[13] A. P. Matthaiou, 'Ἀθηναίοισι τεταγμένοισι ἐν τεμένεϊ Ἡρακλέος (Hdt. 6.108.1)', in *Herodotus and his world: essays from a conference in memory of George Forrest*, ed. P. Derow and R. Parker (Oxford 2003) 190-202, at 151, has convincingly argued that Agora I 4256, which has been taken to be a copy of ep. A, actually comes from a different (possibly private) monument: 'κατὰ ταῦτα εἰς τὸ ἑξῆς ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ Ag I 4256 δὲν πρέπει νὰ θεωρῆται ἀντίγραφοτοῦ μνημείου τῶν Περσικῶν πολέμων, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ἰδιωτικοῦ χαρακτῆρος μνημεῖον, ἴσως ἐπιτύμβιον ...'.

[14] See Petrovic, *Kommentar* (n. 12 above) 160-65, for an overview of suggestions, and C. Keesling, 'The Kallimachos monument on the Athenian Acropolis (CEG 256) and Athenian commemoration of the Persian Wars', in *Archaic and classical Greek epigram*, ed. Baumbach, Petrovic, and Petrovic (n. 5 above) 100-30, at 117-18.

[15] Petrovic, *Kommentar* (n. 12 above) 158-77.

The text of the verse-inscriptions belongs to a monument which, according to the latest reconstructions, was inscribed on three elements (*lapides a*, *b*, *c*) of a fairly long joined base (which consisted of at least four elements),[16] and which carried at least three free-standing *stelae*.[17] Only the base of the monument has survived: texts A) and β) were inscribed on one stone (*lapis a*)); text γ) was inscribed on *lapis b*); and text δ) on *lapis c*).[18] The fragments of the base were found scattered throughout the city: parts of *lapis a* were discovered in the nineteenth and early twentieth century by Rhankabes in Plaka, and Oliver in the Agora respectively.[19] In the 1980s, Angelos Matthaiou managed ingeniously to recognize that *lapis b*) belongs to the same monument, and to identify *lapis c)* with epigram delta in the storage of the third Ephorate in Athens as belonging to the same monument. The original find spot of *lapis c)* was Plataion Street, where the block was reused.[20]

The three stones (*lapides a*, *b* and *c*) are inscribed with the four surviving textual segments A), β), γ) and δ) in two horizontal bands.[21] Epigram A) was inscribed on the smoothed out top of the base, while β), γ), and δ) belong to a somewhat less smooth central field. The text on the monument was inscribed by at least three hands, but all of it seems to have been inscribed at more or less the same time. The date is (relatively) uncontroversial: the letter forms suggest the period of the 470s,[22] and this dating is further corroborated by the type of the monument and the attested epigraphic habit.[23] Almost all the scholars who have discussed this monument take 475 as the *terminus ante quem*.[24] Hence, the monument belongs chronologically to the very period in which the Greeks

[16] A. P. Matthaiou, 'Νέος λίθος του μνημείου με τα επιγράμματα για τους Περσικούς πολέμους', *Horos* 6 (1988) 118-22, and 'Ἀθηναίοισι τεταγμένοισι ἐν τεμένεϊ Ἡρακλέος (Hdt. 6.108.1)' (n. 13 above).

[17] For a detailed reconstruction of the monument see Matthaiou, 'Ἀθηναίοισι τεταγμένοισι ἐν τεμένεϊ Ἡρακλέος (Hdt. 6.108.1)' (n. 13 above), and see discussion in Petrovic, *Kommentar* (n. 12 above) 158-65.

[18] For a drawing of the arrangement of the texts, see B. D. Meritt, 'Epigrams from the battle of Marathon', in *The Aegean and the Near East: studies presented to Hetty Goldman* (New York 1956) 256-80, fig. 1.

[19] For the history of the reconstruction of the monument, see P. Amandry, 'Sur les "épigrammes de Marathon"', in *Theoria. Festschrift für W. H. Schuchhardt*, ed. F. Eckstein (Baden-Baden 1960) 1-8, and Lewis ad *IG* I³ 503/504. For drawings of the monument, see Matthaiou, 'Νέος λίθος' (n. 16 above) 121-22, with nos. 17 and 18.

[20] *SEG* LI 44; A. R. Rhankabes, *Antiquités helléniques ou répertoire d'inscriptions et d'autres antiquités*, vol. II (Athènes 1855) 597, nr. 784b; H. Oliver, 'Selected Greek inscriptions', *Hesperia* 2 (1933) 480-513.

[21] I use the term 'textual segments' here purposefully, as the number of actual epigrams is an issue that needs to be discussed; on this, see below.

[22] See Jacoby, 'Some Athenian epigrams' (n. 5 above) 164 with notes 24 and 26; J. P. Barron, 'All for Salamis', in *Owls to Athens. Essays on classical subjects presented to Sir Kenneth Dover*, ed. E. M. Craik (Oxford 1990) 133-41, at 139; Petrovic, *Kommentar* (n. 12 above) 164.

[23] Matthaiou, 'Νέος λίθος' (n. 16 above) 118-20.

[24] D. L. Page, *Further Greek epigrams* (Cambridge 1981, = *FGE*) 220, relies on the lettering for a date in 480/479.

started populating their cities and public spaces with commemorative texts and had begun shaping their view of the Persian Wars as a completed whole.[25]

This is what we can say with more or less confidence about the historical context of this memorial and its date; everything else is open to interpretation. The question which battle or battles this memorial is commemorating has sprouted extraordinarily lively discussions. The fragmentary state of the text provides a limited number of clues, but most scholars have tended to argue that the monument either commemorates Salamis (*cf.* νήσῳ, γ) 3) or several battles from the Persian Wars at the same time. Based on ἔρκους γὰρ προπάρ̣ο̣ι̣θεν from δ) 1, Angelos Matthaiou has recently reinforced the argument that the entire monument is dedicated to the fallen in the battle of Marathon.[26] The question remains, however, to what extent we can take the references to physical locations from a fragmentary text as a reliable foundation for identification: so, for instance, the notorious 'Gates' from the lines ὅτ' αἰχμὴν / στῆσαν πρόσθε πυλῶν may just as easily be part of a metaphor,[27] and if we take the pointers in the text (too) seriously, then we are looking for a battle that involved foot soldiers (mentioned twice) fighting with spears in front of Gates, probably in the vicinity of the sea and on an island (?) alongside cavalry (?), and who are supposed to be dead, but nevertheless receive οὖθαρ δ' ἀπείρου πορτιτρόφου ἄκρον.[28] That said, an issue requiring an explanation, should one attempt a synthetic interpretation of the texts as relating to a single battle, is the fact that not one, but two deictics were employed in the fragments. This fact implies the existence of several lists of the fallen: ἀνδρῶν τῶνδ' in A) 1 and ἦν ἄρα τοῖσζ' in β) 1 presumably relate to the names of the war-dead inscribed on the three free-standing *stelae* (at least). I am not aware of a *polyandrion* accompanied by a commemorative epigram[29] that would use *two* deictics for one and the same group of the fallen (even if we do know that one deictic is indeed used in epigrams which accompany more than one group of the fallen):[30] what these deictics

[25] On the development of Athenian commemorative practices after Marathon, see K.-J. Hölkeskamp, 'Marathon. Vom Monument zum Mythos', in *Gab es das griechische Wunder? Griechenland zwischen dem Ende des 6. und der Mitte des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, ed. D. Papenfuß and V. M. Strocka (Mainz 2001) 329-53. For monuments to the Persian War dead and their dates, see Hölscher, *Öffentliche Räume* (n. 3 above) 91-95.

[26] Matthaiou takes πανθαλὲς ὄλβος as a reference to the deceased, and therefore the monument ought to be a *polyandrion* in the city. He corroborates his view with a parallel from an unpublished ephebic decree from 176/75 BC, which contains a reference to a *polyandrion* in the city; for a different interpretation of the phrase, see Petrovic, *Kommentar* (n. 12 above) 174-76; Bowie, 'Marathon in fifth-century epigram' (n. 10 above).

[27] See Petrovic, *Kommentar* (n. 12 above) 171-72.

[28] See the insightful observations of Bowie, 'Marathon in fifth-century epigram' (n. 10 above): 'Although I reject Matthaiou's contention that the last line of poem δ demonstrates the commemorated to be dead, the monument's location in or near the δημόσιον σῆμα shows that it is epitaphic (albeit cenotaphic)'.

[29] For a list of commemorative epigrams including some that are certainly non-inscriptional, see W. Peek, *Griechische Versinschriften* (Berlin 1955, = *GVI*) *Staatsbegräbnis*, as well as Peek, *Griechische Grabgedichte* (Darmstadt 1960) 45-57. *GVI* 20 is not an exception to the above rule on deictics, as the first one is supplemented (and unconvincingly so).

[30] Particularly interesting in this respect is ML 48, where one epigram with one deictic (l. 45) is

point towards (no pun intended) is that either we are dealing with more than one *battle* or, in the light of the new epigram from Loukou (see below), we have to maintain the possibility that the monument commemorates more than one *social group* within the civic division.[31]

Furthermore, how many *epigrams* are we actually dealing with? The number of actual poems might be of some importance for the discussion of the identification of the battle. Two deictics certainly imply that at least two separate epigrams ought to be recognized, and judging from γὰρ in δ) 1, which links it closely to the narrative of γ), it seems obvious that not every stone or inscribed field hosted a complete epigram: even though it is a pity that the beginning of epigram γ) is missing, it is obvious that we are not dealing with four (or more) epigrams, but with three (at the very most). Therefore, an Athenian *Siegesallee* as already suggested by Weber and Wilhelm in the late nineteenth century (*i.e*. a series of epigrams dedicated to individual battles rather than as a complex dedicated to a single battle only),[32] possibly of cenotaphic character,[33] still seems to me the likeliest solution and referring to this text as a monument from the Persian Wars remains, perhaps, the most reasonable practice. All the more so, as there is still nothing resembling a consensus about any one of the epigrams and its ascription to a battle. Epigram A) appears to have commemorated all the Athenian dead of the Persian Wars: this seems to me to be the case both because of its position on the monument and because of its layout.[34] It is inscribed above the others and is, apparently, very general (note the mention of foot soldiers and sailors, the claim to have saved all Greece is there as well, *etc*.). For epigram β), most scholars will assume the battle of Marathon, but some have suggested also Salamis (with Psytalleia), Salamis with Plataia, Plataia and the slaves at Marathon, and Phaleron after Marathon.[35] Interestingly enough, there is least disagreement about epigram γ), as almost all scholars accept Salamis, clearly guided by the reading of νήσῳ in line 3. The publication of the new fragment, text fragment δ), which, with two full lines extant, is the best preserved of them all, has greatly influenced the way we thought about the monument. Here, however, we encounter some unexpected difficulties. In the last two

meant to accompany casualty lists of the Athenians fallen in the Chersonese (ll. 1-3), at Byzantium (ll. 49-51), and 'in the other wars'. See also *FGE* Sim. XVI. On the lists, see D. W. Bradeen, 'Athenian casualty lists', *Hesperia* 33 (1964) 16-62 and 'The Athenian casualty lists of 464 BC', *Hesperia* 36 (1967) 321-28. See also C. W. Clairmont, *Patrios nomos. Public burial in Athens during the fifth and fourth centuries B.C*., vols I-II. (Oxford 1983) 46-50; Ebbot, 'The list of the war dead' (n. 8 above) 91.

[31] Is it possible that *IG* I^3 503/504 was also organized by tribal division, like the *Soros* monument (see below)? If so, why do we find Doric influences? Or is it perhaps fathomable that some of the epigrams were concerned with citizen groups, whereas δ) commemorated fallen metics who, to a significant extent, came from Doric speaking cities and territories? On the origin of metics in early classical Athens, see G. Nemeth, 'Metics in Athens', *Acta Ant. Hung*. 41 (2001) 331-48.

[32] See the discussion on the history of the idea in Jacoby, 'Some Athenian epigrams' (n. 5 above) 175-87.

[33] Bowie, 'Marathon in fifth-century epigram' (n. 10 above).

[34] See Petrovic, *Kommentar* (n. 12 above) 158-77.

[35] For an overview, see Petrovic, *Kommentar* (n. 12 above) *ibid*.

lines of text δ) there are recognizable northwestern Greek elements, such as ἄπειρος in line 3, as well as the adjective πορτίτροφος. Both of these are best placed outside Attica and are somewhat dissonant when compared with the dialect of the preceding passages – this ought to raise a number of questions concerning the nature of the monument in general. What are these features doing here? If *lapis c* belongs to the memorial and epigram δ) is hence to be taken as part of the preceding epigram γ) – which may or may not be the case, given that we are lacking text fragments B, Γ and Δ – the reading of the form νήσῳ instead of νάσῳ in γ) causes even more of a headache.

Based on πορτίτροφος[36] I have elsewhere suggested Mykale as one of possible contexts for δ): this tentative proposition is based on the fact that δ) shows distinct non Attic-Ionic elements which require some sort of an explanation within the historical context. Hence, if the series of epigrams is concerned with individual battles and if epigram β), which opens up the sequence on the middle band of the base, is concerned with Marathon, it would be fitting for the series to end – if it is indeed ending on this block – with verses concerning Mykale, a battle in which the Spartan Leotychidas led the Greeks and Xanthippos was in charge of the Athenian troops.[37] This would make dialect forms somewhat more explicable as a tribute to the Spartan contribution to the jointly fought victory. Another plausible suggestion is Ewen Bowie's proposal that the text might be reflecting the Athenians' wish to commemorate Sicilian assistance to the Athenian navy at Salamis.[38] Be that as it may, the form of the monument, as well as its epigrams, seems to suggest that more than just one battle was commemorated by it.

As a memorial, these verse-inscriptions are particularly remarkable, since the monument counts among the earliest commemorations of the Persian Wars and seems to perceive and represent the series of individual battles as one *completed* whole, unified in their presence on the monument as well as by means of focalizations: A) opens up, in a way like programmatic epigrams of a much later period, with the general and all-encompassing theme of virtue in testing times, before sharpening the focus on individual battles in the epigram(s) of the lower band. Similarly, the motif of salvation from slavery (A) 4: ʿΕλλά[δα μ]ὴ πᾶσαν δούλιο[ν ἦμαρ ἰδεῖν]) seems to have been underpinned by the depiction of a series of *aristeiai* on individual battlefields, ending with a reminder of a worthy award for the blood they had shed: fertile farming and pastoral lands have been protected and blessed prosperity of every kind is secured for the living.

Unlike many commemorative epigrams of a later period, this series is, as far as we can tell, distinctly sober and emotionally subdued: there is no word of brilliant youth perished or of the warriors' souls sacrificed, or of any other comparable motif. Instead, we find the

[36] See Bacch. 4.14, where the adjective is used of Metapontum, and *H. Ap.* 21, where no precise geographical location can be determined.

[37] Hdt. 8.131.2-3, 9.90.1 and 9.114.2.

[38] Bowie, 'Marathon in fifth-century epigram' (n. 10 above): 'That in our inscribed verse οὖθαρ δ' ἀπείρου πορτιτρόφου ἄκρον might also refer to south Italy, famous in poetry for its agricultural wealth since Archilochus fr. 22 West, must be given serious consideration. Rhegion, Locri and Croton. As we know from Herodotus (8.47) only one Greek ship from the West fought at Salamis, that of the Pythian victor Phayllos of Croton. I suggest that lines 3-4 of poem δ refer to Phayllos and his trireme, and that they therefore refer to Salamis and not Marathon'.

fallen warriors addressed as men (ἄνδρες) and as foot soldiers (πεζοί), *not* boys (παῖδες) or youths (κοῦροι), while Greek freedom from slavery is portrayed as a sufficient memorial to their virtue.

b) *SEG* LVI 430

Particularly noteworthy is the portrayal of the battle and of the *Marathonomachoi* in the new epigram found in the villa of Herodes Atticus in the Peloponnese (Eva/Loukou). An orthogonal slab of white Pentelic marble with a Lesbian *cymation* (preserved dimensions are h. 0.68 x w. 0.558-0.57 x d. 0.265/0.285, with the bottom part of the *stele* apparently cut off) is inscribed with a text consisting of three elements (from top to bottom: tribal heading, an epigram, and a casualty list). The stone was found by Theodoros Spyropoulos reused in a palaeochristian oven,[39] and was subsequently, after a number of scholarly and media reports,[40] published in a preliminary fashion by Giorgos Spyropoulos in 2009.[41] A full edition, with a commentary, drawing, and four photos, was published by Georgios Steinhauer in the latest edition of *Horos*, and was briefly discussed and translated into English in a more popular publication.[42]

I print Steinhauer's text:

Ἐ ρ ε χ θ ε ῖ [ς]

Φῆμις ἄρ' | hος κιχ[άν]<ει> αἰεὶ ἐὐφαῦς hέσσχατα γαί[ες]
τῦνδ' ἀνδρῦν ἀρετὲν πεύσεται hος ἔθανον
[μ]αρνάμενοι Μέδοισι καὶ ἐσστεφάνοσαν Ἀθένας
[π]αυρότεροι πολλῦν δεχσάμενοι πόλεμον

Δρακοντίδες
Ἀντιφῦν
Ἀφσέφες
Χσένον
Γλαυκιάδες
Τιμόχσενος
Θέογνις
Διόδορος
Εὐχσίας

[39] See Steinhauer, 'Στήλη πεσόντων τῆς Ἐρεχθηίδος' (n. 11 above) 679 with n. 1.

[40] *SEG* LV 413; *SEG* LVI 430.

[41] The brochure of G. T. Spyropoulos, *Οι στήλες των πεσόντων στη μάχη του Μαραθώνα* (Athens 2009), contains a number of photos which show the stone's face covered with a plastic foil, on which a transcription of the recognized letters is written out, so that original cuttings are not readable anymore (with the exception of the photo of the stone on the cover of his booklet). A number of reasonably readable photos were published in Greek newspapers; the photos in Steinhauer, 'Στήλη πεσόντων τῆς Ἐρεχθηίδος' (n. 11 above), are the most reliable of the ones so far accessible.

[42] Steinhauer, 'Στήλη πεσόντων τῆς Ἐρεχθηίδος' (n. 11 above) and *Marathon and the Archaeological Museum* (Athens 2009) 121-22.

Εὐφρονιάδες
16 Εὐκτέμον
Καλλίας
Ἀραιθίδες
Ἀντίας
20 Τόλμις
Θοκυδίδες
Δῖος
Ἀμυνόμαχος
24 Λεπτίνες
Αἰσχραῖος
Πέρον
Φαι[δ]ρίας
[- - - - - - -]

Steinhauer has persuasively argued that the stone is an authentic early fifth-century inscription and ought not to be seen as a copy from a later period.[43] Steinhauer's dating (in my opinion irrefutable) is based on arguments relating to the morphology of the stone itself (both concerning the type of the monument and the form of *kymation*), on the letter forms and interpunction, all of which conform to our expectations for a text of an early fifth-century inscription. Furthermore, he has strengthened his proposed date by pointing out the dittographic spellings (hέσσχατα; ἐσστεφάνοσαν) as an important indicator of the stone's date.[44]

The inscription is of exceptional importance for several reasons. Firstly, with this text we note the earliest casualty list (outside poetic catalogues, such as the one from the Ambrakian epigram),[45] and a list which predates the next one by almost three decades.[46]

[43] This view was occasionally expressed orally; to my knowledge, the latest scholar to suggest this was Patricia Butz at the meeting of the American epigraphic association held in San Antonio in January 2011. The reason why some scholars have pondered on the possibility of a later date are the morphological features of the casualty list. The names on the list are arranged in a fairly idiosyncratic way (see Steinhauer's photos and drawing, with *SEG* LV 413 and LVI 430, where the list is compared with isodomic ashlar masonry): the names are inscribed one per line, with odd lines in stoichedon arrangement, whereas the letters of the names in even lines are also arranged in the stoichedon style, but all the even lines are indented by the space of (roughly) half a letter, when compared with the odd lines (Steinhauer suggests that this is what the term *plinthedon* might be taken to denote). Whereas some scholars think of this as an indicator of a later date or a singular feature, it is neither: Cathy Keesling has observed this phenomenon also for *IG* I^3 394 (*CEG* 179), dated not long after 507/506. See C. Keesling, 'Rereading the Acropolis dedications', in *Lettered Attica. A day of Attic epigraphy*, ed. D. Jordan and J. Traill (Toronto 2003) 41-54, *per* e.-litt. and forthcoming).

[44] For dittography and dating of inscriptions, see F. Graf and S. Iles Johnston, *Ritual texts for the afterlife: Orpheus and the Bacchic gold tablets* (London and New York 2007) ch. 1; Steinhauer, 'Στήλη πεσόντων τῆς Ἐρεχθηίδος' (n. 11 above) 684-85.

[45] *SEG* XLI 540 and above, p. 46.

The list consists mostly of attested Athenian personal names which were inscribed in a fairly marked manner, and perhaps with a reason so – it is tempting to imagine that the list of the fallen played some role in the commemorative competitions organized at Marathon.[47] Secondly, this stone seems to have belonged to the monument Pausanias reports seeing at the *Soros*.[48] In all likelihood it was one (the first to the left, as it were)[49] in the series of ten joined stones commemorating the 192 fallen Athenians, and listing 22 names of the fallen of the tribe of Erechtheis, a tribe whose soldiers probably formed the front line in the Marathon battle.[50] Since we know that the Athenian army marched in the firmly established Cleisthenic tribal order, it is tempting to imagine the ten *stelae* displayed in the same fashion: Erechtheis – Aigeis – Pandionis – Leontis – Akamantis – Oineis – Kekropis – Hipponthotis – Aiantis – Antiochis.[51] At some point in the second century AD, Herodes Atticus, himself by birth from Marathon, had the *stelae* transported to his villa in Loukou, along with further monuments from Marathon, and used them in

[46] See Bradeen, 'Athenian casualty lists' (n. 30 above) for the earliest ones and on *IG* I^3 1144; on poetic renderings/reflexes of the casualty lists in tragedy, see Ebbot, 'The list of the war dead' (n. 8 above) esp. 85-90.

[47] I have argued elsewhere that some of the later commemorative practices included competitions with disciplines such as 'old' and 'new catalogues', consisting of recitals of the names of the fallen warriors. See A. Petrovic, 'Epigrammatic contests, poeti vaganti, and local history', in *Wandering poets in ancient Greek culture: travel, locality and pan-Hellenism*, ed. R. Hunter and I. Rutherford (Cambridge 2009) 195-216. To the evidence adduced there, I would like to add that the Dutch excavators at New Halos in Thessaly have unearthed an inscription (A. Harder, R. Reinders, and E. van der Vliet, 'A genealogical inscription from Halos', *forthcoming*) coming from the late fifth or early fourth century which corresponds to our expectations concerning the old catalogue. The preserved part of this inscription contains 24 dactylic hexameters listing more than 45 names, all of them in the accusative and some of them clearly recognizable as local heroes celebrated in Thessaly. It might be a source of this kind that allowed Herodotus to state that he had learned the names of all 300 fallen Spartans by heart (Hdt. 7.224).

[48] Paus. 1.32.3: δῆμός ἐστι Μαραθὼν ἴσον τῆς πόλεως τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἀπέχων καὶ Καρύστου τῆς ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ· ταύτῃ τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἔσχον οἱ βάρβαροι καὶ μάχῃ τε ἐκρατήθησαν καί τινας ὡς ἀνήγοντο ἀπώλεσαν τῶν νεῶν. τάφος δὲ ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ Ἀθηναίων ἐστίν, ἐπὶ δὲ αὐτῷ στῆλαι τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν ἀποθανόντων κατὰ φυλὰς ἑκάστων ἔχουσαι, καὶ ἕτερος Πλαταιεῦσι Βοιωτῶν καὶ δούλοις· ἐμαχέσαντο γὰρ καὶ δοῦλοι τότε πρῶτον. Trans. W. H. S. Jones: 'There is a parish called Marathon, equally distant from Athens and Carystus in Euboea. It was at this point in Attica that the foreigners landed, were defeated in battle, and lost some of their vessels as they were putting off from the land. On the plain is the grave of the Athenians, and upon it are slabs giving the names of the killed according to their tribes; and there is another grave for the Boeotian Plataeans and for the slaves, for slaves fought then for the first time by the side of their masters'. On the archaeological context, see S. E. Alcock, *Archaeologies of the Greek past: landscape, monuments, and memories* (Cambridge 2002) 78-79, with further literature in n. 74.

[49] See Steinhauer, 'Στήλη πεσόντων τῆς Ἐρεχθηίδος' (n. 11 above) 688 with illustration n. 3 and the reconstruction of the ταφικὸς περίβολος.

[50] See discussion in P. Krentz, *The battle of Marathon* (New Haven and London 2010) 221.

[51] On the tribal order see W. K. Pritchett, *Marathon* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1960) 147-49, with older literature.

the villa's decoration.[52] Finally, this find has some bearing on the way we have been thinking thus far about the number of epigrams adorning monuments for the *Marathonomachoi*: the view that only a rather limited number of verse-inscriptions may be associated with Marathon memorials needs to be revised.[53] For now we can say with some confidence that the *polyandrion* alone in all likelihood consisted of at least ten inscribed *stelae* (one per tribe). If each of the nine remaining *stelae* carried two distichs as well, which seems an inevitable corollary,[54] we would be dealing with a total of 40 verses (an observation which is, perhaps, of some importance also for study of historical elegy).[55] Effectively, we are looking at the opening epigram of what was the longest known series of verse-inscriptions in the fifth century, a predecessor of epigrammatic book collections of later days, and a collection documenting the demonstration of Athenian *aretē* in stone.[56]

Let us take a look at the epigram itself, as it is noteworthy in a number of ways.

Φῆμις ἄρ' | hος κιχ[άν]<ει> αἰεὶ εὐφαῦς hέσσχατα γαί[ες]
τῶνδ' ἀνδρῶν ἀρετὲν πεύσεται hος ἔθανον
[μ]αρνάμενοι Μέδοισι καὶ ἐσστεφάνοσαν Ἀθένας
[π]αυρότεροι πολλῶν δεχσάμενοι πόλεμον.

While the second elegiac couplet is transparent in terms of its meaning ('they crowned the city of Athens, having fought against the Medes, / being few in number, they took up the war against many'), the first couplet is everything but transparent. As I have not seen the stone myself, nor have I had a chance to see high resolution photographs of the first line

[52] Spyropoulos, *Οι στήλες των πεσόντων στη μάχη του Μαραθώνα* (n. 41 above), reflects on whether Herodes Atticus had the memorial transported in the context of his numerous artistic commissions following the death of his lover Polydeukes; see especially Steinhauer, 'Στήλη πεσόντων τῆς Ἐρεχθηίδος' (n. 11 above) 688-89. A summary of older literature on the Loukou estate of Herodes Atticus may be found in W. K. Pritchett, *Studies in ancient topography* 6 (Berkeley 1989) 84-90.

[53] I refrain from listing the older scholarship on the topic, as it now appears irrelevant; some of the issues may be found in *FGE* XX a-b. According to such interpretations, one epigram was customarily associated with the *Soros*, a further one with a 'city-memorial' (typically identified as the *Marathonomachoi* memorial on the Agora); and occasionally a third epigram might be admitted as authentic, which was then thought of as sympotic.

[54] As a matter of fact, Steinhauer, 'Στήλη πεσόντων τῆς Ἐρεχθηίδος' (n. 11 above) 686-87 with image 5, thinks that two fragments (Mus. Astros inv. nos. 586 and 587) found in the excavation area prove conclusively that other *stelae* were inscribed as well; the fragments consist of 1-3 letters.

[55] It remains open whether or not these poems related to each other and thus could be perceived as forming a whole. It is certainly tempting to imagine one such series preceding the Eion epigrams (Aeschines 3.183-85).

[56] Essentially, the publication of the stone from Loukou opens up the possibility that many of the epigrams which we have previously discarded as spurious may actually have belonged to the complex of the memorial. The most obvious candidate for resuscitation is the one quoted by Lycurgus (1.109): Ἑλλήνων προμαχοῦντες Ἀθηναῖοι Μαραθῶνι χρυσοφόρων Μήδων ἐστόρεσαν δύναμιν. Page might well have been right all along: *FGE* 229, 'I continue, therefore, to believe that the epigram quoted by Lycurgus, and his particular version of it, is a copy of an inscription posted beside the casualty-lists on the *Soros* at Marathon in 490 BC'.

(or any other photos save for those published by Steinhauer, Spyropoulos, and the Greek media), I assume that the reading of the first line is correct. In what follows, I rely fully on Steinhauer's careful and judicious edition.

The first line is metrically awkward – the quantities appear simply too long, and next to impossible to force into hexameter: the third foot of this hexameter, <ει> αἰεὶ, can be pressed into the dactylic scheme only with the greatest of difficulties; the same is true of the fourth foot, ἐὐφαῦς. The metrical problems are not much relieved even if one discards the supplemented <ει>, and reads NEI for AIEI, as appears feasible from Steinhauer's drawing: Φῆμις ἄρ' hος κιχ[ά]νει ἐὐφαῦς hέσσχατα γαί[ες].[57] Steinhauer also remarks that the reading of the adjective εὐφαής is problematic;[58] not only does the drawing show a kappa shaped cutting in place of E, but Steinhauer says that in its place one can recognize two vertical strokes.[59]

The epigram is translated by the editor as follows: 'The fame that reaches the ends of the bright earth will carry the news of the virtue of these men, how they died and how they brought glory to Athens, fighting against Medes, few against many'.[60] The Greek translation moves along similar lines: 'Η φήμη, καθὼς πάντα φθάνει (πετῶντας) στὰ πέρατα τῆς φωτεινῆς γῆς / θὰ πληροφορηθεῖ γιὰ τὴν αρετὴ αὐτῶν τῶν ἀνδρῶν, πῶς (γενναῖα) πέθαναν (ὡς ἔθανον) / πολεμῶντας τοὺς Μήδους, καὶ (πῶς) δόξασαν τὴν Ἀθήνα / πολὺ λιγότεροι (αὐτοὶ), ἀντιμετωπίζοντες στὴ μάχη πολλούς'.[61] There are several difficulties with the translations of the first distich. The first word of the epigram, φῆμις, rather surprising as it is,[62] could, perhaps be taken to mean 'fame' without too much stretching,[63] but hος cannot be taken as a demonstrative pronoun relating to feminine φῆμις. Even more pronounced is the meaning imposed on the verb πυνθάνομαι. πεύσεται, third person singular future, cannot be extended so far as to mean 'carry'. The modern Greek πληροφορηθεῖ is closer, but then a more precise translation of φῆμις is needed and requires more hermeneutic work: what could Φῆμις denote, so as to be capable of 'learning the virtue of these men here', and what kind of Φῆμις can reach ἔσσχατα γαῖας? Let us render φῆμις in its most elementary meaning as 'utterance', some sort of utterance will recognize (understand, learn by hearing) the virtue of these men here. And this it will

[57] See Steinhauer, 'Στήλη πεσόντων τῆς Ἐρεχθηίδος' (n. 11 above) 681: '῾Η προτεινομένη ἀνάγνωση κιχ[άν]<ει> αἰεί, (γρ. 11-19), ἡ ὁποία βασίστηκε στὰ ἀναγνωριζόμενα ΚΙΧ (11-13) καὶ Α|ΕΙ (γρ. 16-19), παρουσιάζει τόσο σοβαρὲς δυσκολίες, ὥστε νὰ ἀποτελεῖ πραγματικὴ crucem'.

[58] The adjective was thus far a *hapax legomenon*, attested in Nonnos, *D.* 8.111 relating to stars.

[59] Steinhauer, 'Στήλη πεσόντων τῆς Ἐρεχθηίδος' (n. 11 above) 681.

[60] Steinhauer, *Marathon and the Archaeological Museum* (n. 42 above) 122.

[61] Steinhauer, 'Στήλη πεσόντων τῆς Ἐρεχθηίδος' (n. 11 above) 681.

[62] No other epigram I am aware of opens with this word. The first thing that came to mind is that the epigram belongs to the φημί-type; the question of how adequate (or indeed, at all possible) something like φημὶ γάρ or φημὶ καί would be will have to be put aside.

[63] *LSJ* note this meaning for φημή (s.v.), of which φῆμις is a poetic form, and list Hdt. 1.31 as a parallel. The common meanings of φῆμις, however, are 'speech; reputation; common opinion or judgement expressed in talk; gossip'; the meaning 'fame' is not registered. *Cf. LSJ* s.v. φῆμις.

do, as (taking hoς as ὡς, 'as', introducing an adverbial clause in the indicative)[64] it reaches ('always' or not – with or without αἰεί) the ends of the world.

However, before we continue with exegetical work, we need to ask ourselves when exactly was this monument set up? Memorials for the battle of Marathon were being set up for generations after the battle, but most of the surviving ones are dated to the post-Plataea period.[65] Likewise, most of the casualty lists and monuments for the fallen in the Persian Wars date from the same time.[66] The epitymbic memorial discussed above (*IG* I^3 503/504) was apparently set up between 480 and 475; the letter-forms of *SEG* LVI 430, fickle guide as they can be, do resemble quite closely the letter forms of *IG* I^3 503/504 (*cf.* letters A, Γ, Θ, Λ, M, N, Π, P, Σ, Y), with the exception of X which consists of a vertical and a horizontal stroke in *SEG* LVI 430.[67] It seems to me very likely that the monument was inscribed either towards the end of the 480s or, perhaps, since the stone does not seem to have been affected by the Persian destruction of Attica in 480/79, between 480-75.

At any rate, if either of these two proposed dates is correct, then, the epigram ought to be read in a highly charged political context. It is difficult to imagine that any Athenian of the late 480s or post Plataea could have read or heard the words Φῆμις and hέσσχατα γαί[ες], especially in the context of a memorial for the fallen in the Persian Wars, without thinking of the ominous oracle delivered to the Athenians by Delphi at some point in the second half of the 480s.[68] Φήμη, from which the poetic form Φῆμις is derived, is of course very well attested in the fifth century BC as a noun denoting oracular utterance (both true and false), utterances discerned by *prophētai*,[69] and was underway (if not more) towards divine personification already by Hesiod's day.[70] The Delphic prophecy, delivered to the Athenians in the late 480s, at the dawn of Xerxes' invasion, is reported by Herodotus as follows:[71]

[64] *Cf. LSJ*, s.v. ὡς A II.

[65] Gauer, *Weihgeschenke* (n. 3 above) 21-44; M. C. Miller, *Athens and Persia in the fifth century BC: a study in cultural receptivity* (Cambridge 2004) 30-32.

[66] See Hölscher, *Öffentliche Räume* (n. 3 above) 91-95.

[67] As far as one can judge from Steinhauer's photos and drawing for *SEG* LVI 430; for *IG* I^3 503/504 I have looked at squeezes published by the Center for Epigraphical and Palaeographical Studies of Ohio State University (permanent link: http://hdl.handle.net/2374.OX/245). Another difference is in the use of a tricolon in *IG* I^3 503/504. For X written as + in 500-480 Attica, see also L. H. Jeffery, *The local scripts of archaic Greece* (Oxford 1961, ²1991) 78.44.

[68] For discussion of the oracle, its date, and the political context, see H. Bowden, *Classical Athens and the Delphic oracle: divination and democracy* (Cambridge 2005) 101-05.

[69] For personification of Pheme, see R. Parker, *Athenian religion* (Oxford 1997) 233-37; E. Stafford, *Worshipping virtues. Personification and the divine in the Greek world* (London 2000) 10-11. See *LSJ*, s.v. and S. *Trach*. 1149-50 with Plat. *Timaeus* 72a-b and V. Rossi, *Filostrato. Eroico* (Venezia 1997) 193.

[70] *Cf.* Hes. *Works and Days* 764 and Stafford, *Worshipping virtues* (n. 69 above) 10-11.

[71] Hdt. 7.140.

ὦ μέλεοι, τί κάθησθε; λιπὼν φεῦγ' ἔσχατα γαίης / δώματα καὶ πόλιος τροχοειδέος ἄκρα κάρηνα. / οὔτε γὰρ ἡ κεφαλὴ μένει ἔμπεδον οὔτε τὸ σῶμα, / οὔτε πόδες νέατοι οὔτ' ὦν χέρες, οὔτε τι μέσσης / λείπεται, ἀλλ' ἄζηλα πέλει· κατὰ γάρ μιν ἐρείπει / πῦρ τε καὶ ὀξὺς Ἄρης, Συριηγενὲς ἅρμα διώκων. / πολλὰ δὲ κἄλλ' ἀπολεῖ πυργώματα κοὐ τὸ σὸν οἶον, / πολλοὺς δ' ἀθανάτων νηοὺς μαλερῷ πυρὶ δώσει, / οἵ που νῦν ἱδρῶτι ῥεούμενοι ἑστήκασι, / δείματι παλλόμενοι, κατὰ δ' ἀκροτάτοις ὀρόφοισι / αἷμα μέλαν κέχυται, προϊδὸν κακότητος ἀνάγκας. / ἀλλ' ἴτον ἐξ ἀδύτοιο, κακοῖς δ' ἐπικίδνατε θυμόν.

Wretches, why do you linger here? Rather flee from your houses and city, / Flee to the ends of the earth from the circle embattled of Athens! / The head will not remain in its place, nor in the body, / Nor the feet beneath, nor the hands, nor the parts between; / But all is ruined, for fire and the headlong god of war speeding in a Syrian chariot will bring you low. / Many a fortress too, not yours alone, will he shatter; / Many a shrine of the gods will he give to the flame for devouring; / Sweating for fear they stand, and quaking for dread of the enemy, / Running with gore are their roofs, foreseeing the stress of their sorrow; / Therefore I bid you depart from the sanctuary. / Have courage to lighten your evil. (Trans. A. D. Godley)

The response of the Athenian *theopropoi*, as reported by Herodotus, was to demand another prophecy, since they refused to return to Athens with the one they had just received. The second φήμη was almost as pessimistic as the first one, still insisting on the Athenians not taking up the fight against the Persians and advising them to depart from Attica in advance of the battle:[72]

οὐ δύναται Παλλὰς Δί' Ὀλύμπιον ἐξιλάσασθαι / λισσομένη πολλοῖσι λόγοις καὶ μήτιδι πυκνῇ. / σοὶ δὲ τόδ' αὖτις ἔπος ἐρέω ἀδάμαντι πελάσσας. / τῶν ἄλλων γὰρ ἁλισκομένων ὅσα Κέκροπος οὖρος / ἐντὸς ἔχει κευθμών τε Κιθαιρῶνος ζαθέοιο, / τεῖχος Τριτογενεῖ ξύλινον διδοῖ εὐρύοπα Ζεύς / μοῦνον ἀπόρθητον τελέθειν, τὸ σὲ τέκνα τ' ὀνήσει. / μηδὲ σύ γ' ἱπποσύνην τε μένειν καὶ πεζὸν ἰόντα / πολλὸν ἀπ' ἠπείρου στρατὸν ἥσυχος, ἀλλ' ὑποχωρεῖν / νῶτον ἐπιστρέψας· ἔτι τοι ποτε κἀντίος ἔσσῃ. / ὦ θείη Σαλαμίς, ἀπολεῖς δὲ σὺ τέκνα γυναικῶν / ἤ που σκιδναμένης Δημήτερος ἢ συνιούσης.

Vainly does Pallas strive to appease great Zeus of Olympus; / Words of entreaty are vain, and so too cunning counsels of wisdom. / Nevertheless I will speak to you again of strength adamantine. All will be taken and lost that the sacred border of Cecrops / Holds in keeping today, and the dales divine of Cithaeron; / Yet a wood-built wall will by Zeus all-seeing be granted / To the Trito-born, a stronghold for you and your children. / Await not the host of horse and foot coming from Asia, / Nor be still, but turn your back and withdraw from the foe. / Truly a day will come when you will meet him face to face. / Divine Salamis, you will bring death to women's sons / When the corn is scattered, or the harvest gathered in. (Trans. A. D. Godley)

[72] Hdt. 7.141.

Looking back at the text from Loukou with these oracles in mind, it is difficult to escape the impression that it ought to be read as part of this very discourse: what the epigram stresses is not the splendid victory the Athenians have won, or the defeat of the enemy, but rather the fact that the Athenian army has remained in place at Marathon, and that it has taken up the battle even though the Athenians were outnumbered (l. 3 [μ]αρνάμενοι Μέδοισι; l. 4: π]αυρότεροι πολλῶν δεχσάμενοι πόλεμον). Both of these formulations, new and innovative at this point, will become standard references in commemorative epigrams in the decades following the battle of Marathon, having become standard models of commemorative praise of the fallen.[73]

It seems to me, therefore, that with this verse-inscription we find a jab against a 'medizing' oracle,[74] an early attestation of oracular criticism, a phenomenon which will become more prominently represented in later decades of the fifth century. This might, perhaps, be evident already in the fact that the oracle is referred to as φήμις, rather than by the much less ambiguous and much more pious term χρησμός (which is both metrically possible and attested in fifth-century BC poetry).[75] Furthermore, such interpretation of the epigram fits well with the historical context. In spite of the still gloomy message of the second received oracle, the Athenians decided to interpret it as a positive one. In this sense, Andrew Ford astutely observed that Themistocles' exegesis of the oracle based on the phrase ὦ θείη Σαλαμίς as an indicator of the forthcoming Persian – not Greek – perdition, is to be seen as an early case of oracular criticism.[76] Correspondingly, the formulation ἔσσχατα γαῖας ('the ends of the earth'), mentioned in the first line of the new epigram, represents an elegant inversion of the first oracular message they received: instead of the Athenians who were prompted to leave their homes and seek refuge, it is the oracular voice that will learn the virtue of the *Marathonomachoi* who stood their ground and fought against the Medes, as it reaches the edges of the earth.

In the light of the discussion above, I would suggest the following translation of the epigram:

> The divine utterance, as it reaches the ends of the glowing earth, will learn the virtue of these men here, because [taking ὡς in l. 2 as a causal conjunction with verbs of learning][77] they have died fighting the Medes and have crowned Athens, having taken on the battle being very few against the many.

[73] For μάρναμαι, see *CEG* 135.2, 458/57 BC; *CEG* 142.2 Akarnania, 475-50 BC; *CEG* 658.2 Arcadia, 352 BC; 740.2 Pamphylia, 300 BC; *CEG* 6ii.2 Attica, *ca*. 449-09 BC; *CEG* 82.2 Attica, *ca*. 450-25 BC; *CEG* 155.2, Paros, *ca*. 476/75 BC. On the topic of few against many, see M. Jung, *Marathon und Plataiai: Zwei Perserschlachten als "lieux de mémoire" im antiken Griechenland* (Göttingen 2006) 128-31.

[74] See H. W. Parke and D. E. W. Wormell, *The Delphic oracle*, vols I-II (Oxford 1956) I.141-79.

[75] *Cf*., *e.g*., Pi. *P*. 4.60; A. *Pr*. 662.

[76] A. Ford, *The origins of criticism: literary culture and poetic theory in classical Greece* (Princeton 2008) 83-84.

[77] See *LSJ*, s.v. IV.1, 'with Substantive Clauses, with verbs of learning, saying, *etc*., that, expressing a fact, γνωτὸν ..., ὡς ἴδη Τρώεσσιν ὀλέθρου πείρατ' ἐφῆπται Il. 7.402'.

This text, then, does not reduce the portrayal of the *Marathonomachoi* to its immediate historical context, but rather it includes also the aftermath and the dominant political discourse of the time of its naissance. In this text we find the process of heroization of the *Marathonomachoi* rather far advanced – the men of Erechtheis fought and won not just against the Persians, but also against the powers of divine prophecy, putting on marvelous display the limitless powers of human agency when confronted with divine predetermination. All things considered, and judging from the later reception of the modes of praise first attested in this epigram, such as is apparent from later widespread use of the motifs of heroic struggle ([μ]αρνάμενοι), transference of agonal language into the language of praise for the fallen (ἐσστεφάνοσαν Ἀθέναϛ), victory against the odds ([π]αυρότεροι πολλῶν), and the '¡No pasarán!' *topos* (δεχσάμενοι πόλεμον), with the publication of this epigram we have found one of the archetypal portrayals of the *Marathonomachoi* and the model of heroic praise upon which all later epitymbic commemorations would be measured.

Postscript:

Since submission of my manuscript in summer 2011, a number of important publications on both inscriptions appeared, and I regret that I am not able to discuss these in detail in the body of my paper. Here, I can only briefly acknowledge some of the points and direct readers toward relevant publications. The casualty list from Loukou, as the text of the inscription itself (SEG LVI 430), continues to attract significant attention:

W. Ameling's article (*ZPE* 176, 2011, 10-23) argues for an early date of SEG LVI 430, and provides many valuable observations on the casualty list;

C. Keesling's forthcoming paper (my n. 1 and 43) has been published in the meantime (*ZPE* 180, 2012, 139-48) and dates the stele in the decade 490-480 or 480-470;

G. Proietti shared her paper with me in advance of the publication (now published in *ZPE* 185, 2013, 24-30) in which she argues, based on stylistic criteria and on what is perceived by her as formulaic elements, for a later date for the text of the epigram (4th c. BC or later); while in many ways insightful, I remain unconvinced by the proposition of a later date or of a later forgery because of methodological difficulties associated with use of stylistic criteria in dating.

G. Proietti also discussed IG I3 503/4, making an interesting case against inclusion of lapis B (Peek fragment) as constitutive element of the monument.

An exhaustive and careful treatment of the Loukou inscription has been offered by M. Tentori Montalto (*ZPE* 185, 2013, 31-52) who studied the stone itself and has produced a squeeze (now in BBAW archive). He offers a diplomatic reading Φ Ε Μ Ι Σ Α Ι Η Ο Σ Δ. Κ Ι Χ Σ Α Ι Ε Ι Η Υ Φ Α Ο Σ Ι Τ Ε Σ Σ Χ Α Τ Α Γ Α Ι Ε Σ and takes Φ Ε Μ Ι Σ Α Ι as Φέμισαι ('seconda persona singolare dell'imperativo medio' of aorist φημίζω) but still assumes a sizable *locus corruptus* in the first line. Tentori-Montalto offers also a fresh perspective on the lay-out of the casualty list, and supports an early date (but leaves it open how early: p. 48 'Non è possibile stabilire, però, se il πολυανδρεῖον di Maratona sia stato eretto subito dopo la battaglia oppure dopo le Guerre Persiane, più o meno contemporaneamente all'altro monumento in memoria dei Maratonomachi nel Demosion Sema di Atene').